DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 853 HE 006 010

TITLE	An Inquiry into Departmental Policies and Practices in Relation to Graduate Education of Foreign Students.
INSTITUTION	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Cleveland, Ohio. Field Service Program.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	58p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th Street, N. W., Washington D.C. 20009 ($0.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Counseling; Departments; Doctoral Degrees; *Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Educational Practice; *Foreign Students; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; Masters Degrees; Universities

ABSTRACT

This report is the result of inquiries conducted during the winter of 1971 at 12 universities into departmental policies and procedures in relation to the foreign student. Two departments were surveyed at each university, providing 24 reports or case studies. The results were reviewed by the members of the Task Force on Crucial Issues, and conclusions were synthesized indicating: (1) Effective cooperation exists between the administrators of the academic departments surveyed and the universities' foreign student advisor's offices. (2) Departments do not provide special orientation and counseling services for their foreign students. (3) Most of the departments are not accommodating the special needs and problems of foreign students, except adjusting course loads during the initial semester if a language handicap exists. (4) In one-third of the departments surveyed a few foreign students serve on departmental committees. (5) The departments offer neither special services nor special programs to foreign students as differentiated from those available to all students. (6) Doctoral candidates are not encouraged to write theses in absentia on topics pertinent to their own countries. (7) In most departments, the faculty will make an effort to determine the unique needs of a student's country in planning his program. (MJM)

AN INQUIRY INTO DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN RELATION TO THE GRADUATE EDUCATION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS

ED 097853

Published by the

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM

April, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 010

NAFSA CENTRAL OFFICE: 1860-19th STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

Please order from this address

Charge of fifty cents per copy to cover costs of handling and mailing; bulk rates furnished on request

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Introduction v

Group I – Institutional Policy 1

Group II – Departmental Policy 5

Group III – Admissions 11

Group IV – Financial Aid 19

Group V – English 23

Group VI – Services and Programs 27

Postscript 33

Appendices 43

Appendix A
– Statement of Purposes and Objectives 43

Appendix B
– Checklist of Issues and Questions 47

Appendix C
– Commentary by the Task Force on the Checklist . 51

Appendix D
– Listing of Universities and Departments Surveyed . 55

FOREWORD

In October, 1970 at Brainerd, Minnesota, an ad hoc group representing a broad cross-section from within the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs met for the purpose of identifying and discussing crucial issues in the education of foreign students. This group included foreign student advisers, admissions officers, teachers of English as a second language and community program personnel. Areas of concern with recommendations for investigation were referred to the Executive Committee of NAFSA's Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars. Of the several issues specified, the Council decided that an in depth examination of departmental policies and practices in relation to the foreign graduate student was immediately required and appointed a Task Force on Crucial Issues (listed below) to design and carry it out. Recognizing the experimental nature of the project, the Task Force decided to limit the investigation to six disciplines and 12 universities, rather than broadcasting a questionnaire to the many educational institutions in the United States enrolling foreign graduate students. Each university was asked to report on two academic departments—thereby producing 24 reports in all. In addition to obtaining knowledge about the foreign graduate student vis-a-vis the graduate department it was the hope of the Task Force that this pilot study could serve as a model for any institution of higher learning interested in the kind of self-analysis and evaluation which it might produce.

The 24 reports were thoroughly and thoughtfully prepared. These reports provided the basis for this publication which consists of an introduction, summary findings, general conclusions, appropriate commentary by the Task Force, and a postscript.

The Task Force is indebted to the 12 university representatives who conducted the interviews on the campuses and who, unfortunately, must remain anonymous, and to the many graduate deans, department heads, admitting officers, financial aid officers, secretaries and students who cooperated so willingly and responsibly in the project. It is also

thankful to the NAFSA Field Service Program (Katherine C. Bang, Director) for its sustaining encouragement and support and to the U.S. Department of State for providing the funds which made the project possible. For her patience, good counsel and hard effort our thanks to Barbara Ostrander who summarized and synthesized the 24 case studies and prepared the initial draft. Mrs. Ostrander and Robert A. Schuiteman co-edited the final report.

Marvin Baron
Josef Mestenhauser
Dante Scalzi
William Zimmerman
Robert Schuiteman, Chairman

INTRODUCTION

This report is the result of inquiries conducted during the winter of 1971 at 12 universities into departmental policies and procedures in relation to the foreign graduate student. As mentioned in the Foreword, two departments were surveyed at each university, providing 24 reports or case studies in all. The results were reviewed by the members of the Task Force and this report is a synthesis of the conclusions reached by these persons.

The interest of large American universities has become increasingly focused on the foreign graduate student rather than on the foreign undergraduate. Data are available on the countries of origin of these students, which institutions they attend, the academic fields they enter, and related information. However, there is relatively little collective knowledge on a number of issues that lie beneath the statistical surface and the Task Force sought to design a project that would examine the following kinds of questions:

- What are the primary motives that lead academic departments to admit substantial numbers of foreign students?
- What specific contributions are expected of foreign students?
- To what extent does the department feel an obligation to prepare foreign students for a professional career in their home countries?
- Should there be quotas on the enrollment of foreign students at a time when there are strong enrollment pressures coming from American students? If so, how would these quotas be determined?
- Are departments accepting foreign students in order to maintain quality and quantity in the departmental enrollment?
- From a qualitative standpoint, how useful is our education to foreign students, and are the particular interests of foreign students taken into consideration by the departments?
- Do the departments offer special services in areas such as orientation and counseling to foreign students?

To assist the individuals conducting the survey, the questions above and related issues were incorporated into a checklist (see Appendices).

Purpose:

The purpose of this project was threefold:

1] By compiling and studying the answers to a number of fundamental questions asked of departments at 12 large American universities, NAFSA would be closer to acquiring an accurate profile on a national basis of how foreign students actually fit into our graduate schools.

2] Once the inquiry was completed, it was thought that enough would have been learned about what questions to ask, and how to ask them, so that this information could form the basis for a national model that might serve any institution in this country interested in undertaking its own study of these fundamental issues.

3] It was foreseen that there would be enough substance in the responses to serve as a stimulus for further study, for intensive discussions at workshops, and for making recommendations through appropriate channels for possible changes in the education of foreign graduate students if critical imbalances or problem areas were uncovered.

Procedure:

The project was divided into three phases:

1] Designing the study, selecting participants and universities, and determining procedures;

2] Conducting the investigations, writing individual reports, and giving a preliminary oral presentation at the 1971 national NAFSA conference;

3] Preparing, publishing and distributing the summary report and making decisions about utilization of the results.

As finally constituted, the Task Force responsible for the study consisted of: Marvin Baron, University of California, Berkeley; Dr. Josef Mestenhauser, University of Minnesota; Dr. Dante Scalzi, Pennsylvania State University; William Zimmerman, Northwestern University; and Dr. Robert Schuiteman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chairman. Phase 1 was carried out by Messrs. Baron, Scalzi and Schuiteman.

Twelve universities across the United States participated in the study. Most geographical areas of the country were represented and both public and private universities were included (5 private and 7 public). Only institutions with graduate departments and more than 400 foreign students were considered. The universities selected had to have a NAFSA member available to conduct the interviews, someone who was known to the Task Force as competent to carry out the project and who had either expressed an interest in it or was considered knowledgeable in foreign student affairs. Two academic departments were surveyed at each participating university and written reports were subsequently submitted to the Task Force for review. In order to encourage candid and complete answers, the universities and reporters were promised anonymity. Therefore, their names will not appear in this report.

Six disciplines were chosen that would represent the physical sciences, the social sciences and engineering. They are chemistry, electrical engineering, civil engineering, business administration or management, economics and educational administration. Disciplines that might be more developmentally oriented (such as educational administration) were included as well as those that were less developmentally oriented (such as chemistry). Disciplines included were represented by both small and large enrollments of foreign students as reflected in *Open Doors 1970*.[1] However, the number of foreign students actually enrolled in the discipline at a single university was not a consideration for selection. It was assumed that some of the departments queried would have small foreign student populations while others would have large ones. It was also assumed that there would be considerable variation among the departments surveyed in the proportion of foreign graduate students to U.S. graduate students.

---

[1] *Open Doors 1970 Report on International Exchange* (New York: Institute of International Education). Annual census of enrolled foreign students in higher education, etc.

Conduct of the Survey:

A broad statement of purposes and objectives of the project was prepared and a comprehensive checklist of issues and questions was developed for use as a guide by the university interviewers. This statement and checklist as written by the Task Force are included in the Appendices, along with commentary on the usefulness of the checklist. Although the checklist was not intended to be used as a questionnaire, it did suggest the issues that the Task Force believed were important in obtaining an in depth view of the policies, procedures, and attitudes of the departments in relation to foreign graduate students. The checklist served as a model for the preparation of the individual reports and for the organization of the findings contained in this composite report.

The issues that were covered were grouped into six areas: I – institutional policy, II – departmental policy, III – admissions, IV – financial aid, V – English and VI – services and programs.

The individual members of the survey team and the Task Force participated in an orientation meeting prior to conducting the investigation. At this meeting, the background of the project was presented, materials for use in conducting the survey were reviewed, and the interviewing process was thoroughly discussed. The meeting also provided an opportunity for the survey team to raise questions and to reach agreement on the ways in which the reports about the departments should be written.

The two departments on each participating campus were surveyed through discussions with department faculty, directors of graduate study, department chairmen, and foreign graduate students enrolled in the department. In addition, university administrators from graduate schools (e.g. graduate deans) and from admissions offices (e.g. foreign admissions officers or directors) were interviewed. Although students were included, the inquiry was directed primarily toward faculty and administration. A separate case study report was written on each department and submitted to the Task Force members. Although the study was originally designed to provide four reports on each of the six disciplines, circumstances that developed during the course of the survey made

it necessary to substitute one university and one department for those previously selected. This resulted in five reports submitted on two disciplines (chemistry and economics), four reports on two (civil and electrical engineering) and three reports on two (management/business administration and educational administration).

Preparation of the Report:

The Task Force gave a verbal report on preliminary findings at the annual NAFSA conference in May, 1971. An editor was retained to prepare materials for a June meeting of the Task Force at which the findings were reviewed and evaluated, and to write a first draft. This draft report was submitted to the Task Force and their comments and suggestions have been considered in preparing the final report.

The findings from the 24 case studies, general conclusions, and commentary of the Task Force, are reported on the following pages. Unless specifically mentioned, there were no significant differences in responses based on field (department) or type (public or private) of institution. As previously indicated, the checklist that was used by the survey team provides the outline for the contents of this report.

GROUP I – INSTITUTIONAL POLICY

Findings

Of the 12 universities surveyed, six (all public) reported that they have articulated a philosophy or rationale on international education–in the form of written policies, reports from study commissions, or other kinds of published statements. However, these statements were reported by the survey team as broad pronouncements of general objectives or purposes for involvement in international education. They do not contain plans for implementation and are not used as functional guidelines in day-to-day working situations. The actual statements on international education were not included in the reports submitted by the survey team. However, a few of the reports did contain brief excerpts or phrases from the statements and the general thrust of them is to cite the world role and responsibility of the university and the importance of cross-cultural awareness and learning.

Although the private universities surveyed have been involved in international education, including the education of foreign students, almost from the time of their founding, none has developed a written policy for such activity.

Of the six universities reporting general statements of policy on international education, three have developed some kind of further description of their purposes for educating foreign students. These statements contain phrases describing such objectives as: enriching the educational environment, furthering the universality of the institution, assisting other countries in development, and helping qualified students achieve educational goals.

Despite the lack of specific institutional guidelines, almost all of the universities surveyed believe that they are committed to the values of international education and international educational exchange. They believe that their commitment is demonstrated by the various ways in which their campuses are presently involved and have been involved for at least the last two and one half decades. As the reporters saw it, evidence of institutional commitment is demonstrated through such activities and programs as: administrative and budgetary

support for various campus international offices, international dimensions in the curriculum of some departments, international study materials, involvement in overseas projects, participation in student and faculty exchange programs, enrollment of foreign students from the earliest days of the university, and institutional memberships in international education organizations.

Despite the appropriateness cited by some universities for not having developed specific international policies in the past (e.g. diversity within the institution, greater flexibility of operation, security in "unwritten" practices, etc.), there is now reason to believe that the picture is changing. With burgeoning enrollments, new domestic priorities, and the scarcity of economic resources, the current absence of a coherent, institutional policy may make foreign student programs more vulnerable to those legislators, administrators, trustees and alumni who are beginning to question the presence of large numbers of foreign students on campus.

In the three cases where policies and procedures relating to foreign student programs had been formulated, top level administrators, faculty and students had been consulted during the development of these statements. Trustees, foreign student advisers and admissions officials were involved to a lesser degree in these formulations.

Six of the universities surveyed reported varying kinds of institutional, college and departmental procedures for the coordination of international and foreign student programs. In most institutions, coordination results from meeting a need, formal procedures or lack of them notwithstanding. For the most part, this coordination is problem and service oriented–i.e. it seems to function well at the working level but does not usually occur at higher, policy making levels. It was generally agreed that greater coordination is needed of the various kinds of international programs on the campuses.

General Conclusions

- Most of the universities surveyed do not have functional policies in support of their involvement in international education and their enrollment of foreign students.
- However, most of these universities believe that they

have demonstrated their commitment to international education through their programs and services without formalized policies.

- Concern was shown that in this current period of changing national and educational priorities, the absence of well articulated institutional policies may make foreign student programs particularly vulnerable to attack.
- All interested parties have not been involved in the formulation of policies where they do exist.
- Only half of the institutions surveyed have formal procedures regarding the coordination of their international programs. Despite this, actual coordination occurs from necessity in most institutions but it is usually problem and service oriented. There is consensus that greater coordination of the various kinds of international programs on the campuses is needed.

Commentary by the Task Force

We suggest that there is a need for continuing dialogue within academic institutions concerning the institution's objective or purpose for involvement in international education and for educating foreign students. The determination of whether this dialogue will result in the development of written institutional policies should grow out of these deliberations as suited to each institution's circumstances and needs. The answers to the question of what purpose a university-wide policy will serve coupled with knowledge of the process and constraints of implementation within the institution, should provide guidance in deciding whether a written institutional policy is warranted. From our data, it appears not to have made much difference to the current programs in international education whether or not a written policy exists. It seems that when a need for a policy has arisen, it has been formulated. However, in these difficult days, institutions of higher education must make hard decisions about priorities. Unless a forward looking policy in regard to international education is considered, the danger exists that the institution, and the departments within it, may find themselves arbitrarily restricted in their international activities without the opportunity of thinking about the relevance of international

education to their total educational program.

The singularly important activity in the process of policy formulation is the reexamination itself–i.e. a thorough review of the institution's international goals by existing structures within the university. We believe that discussion of the role and value of foreign students on the campus should be an integral part of this review. Too few institutions have worked out a clear-cut rationale as to why they accept foreign students at all. We urge broad participation in the process of review by appropriate university officers, administrators (including graduate deans and foreign student advisers), departmental faculty, and both U.S. and foreign students. Once the institution defines its purposes in enrolling foreign students, appropriate programs should grow out of the process of developing and implementing this definition.

For those institutions that have articulated a policy it may be necessary to review such statements in the light of changes that have occurred subsequent to their formulation–changes in: funding, research and teaching priorities within the departments, the size and composition of the foreign student component, the direction of the international commitment, faculty strength, etc. in order that it may be a current and viable pronouncement. In formulating a restatement, the institution may (or should) consider the need not only for general institutional objectives, but more specifically, individual departmental goals (compatible with departmental strengths and interests) especially as these goals may be applicable to "developing societies".

GROUP II – DEPARTMENTAL POLICY

Findings

The departments emphasized their overriding interest in enrolling the most qualified students, judged by academic standards. This and the related criteria of making the best use of their educational facilities and maintaining the quality of the department appear to be their most salient objectives in enrolling graduate students regardless of nationality.

The departments surveyed have not developed written or implied policies concerning either departmental involvement in international education or admittance of foreign students into their graduate programs. Given the loose institutional framework reported in the last section, it is not surprising that the departments have instead developed their own ad-hoc procedures on foreign students independent of any university philosophy and of the procedures of other departments. From the departmental perspective, things seem to be working well, and, therefore, most departments have not given much thought to intercultural education. As a result, they are not making a conscious effort to capitalize on the presence of foreign students in their departments – i.e. on the contributions foreign students can make to the educational process.

Yet, when asked specifically what they hoped to gain from the presence of foreign students, departmental personnel most frequently cited the following: the addition of a different perspective to discussions and projects, the encouragement of an interchange of ideas among students and faculty from many cultures through fostering an international mix, the creation and/or maintenance of an international atmosphere within the department that enriches the program, the enhancement of the international reputation of the university and the department, and the exposure of U.S. students to cultures and ideas that emanate from different cultural backgrounds. These potential benefits are understood philosophically but are not intentionally incorporated into the decision the departments make to admit foreign

students. Neither is there much evidence that these philosophical reasons have been utilized to develop meaningful programs once the foreign student is on the campus.

In a minority of responses, there was some evidence that: a few departments do not expect to gain at all from the presence of foreign students, foreign students are beginning to be admitted in greater numbers—to avoid admitting second level U.S. students—thereby maintaining a department's academic quality, and increased faculty exchange with overseas institutions is resulting from educating foreign graduate students here.

Almost all the departments surveyed reported that they expect the same level of performance from foreign students as they do from U.S. students. Most departments are willing, however, to make special concessions to the entering foreign student during his initial semester by reducing his course load if he needs additional work in English or by arranging a lighter program while he is adjusting to a new environment and educational system.

In addition, almost all the departments surveyed believe that foreign students perform as well academically as U.S. students, although there were a few exceptions in both directions. The departments also state that foreign students receive their degrees in the same length of time as U.S. students. However, very few departments keep statistics on these, and other, foreign student performance levels. In some of these cases, it appears that the absence of data is a direct result of a department's attitude that foreign students are not thought of as a separate group of students.

Departments that commented at all on their impressions of foreign students noted a few characteristics. As described, foreign students are perceived by departments to be among the best and poorest of their graduate students, more successful as research assistants than as teaching assistants, more theoretical and analytical than U.S. students, less mechanical (in working with equipment) and practical than U.S. students, and more industrious and hard-working than U.S. students.

There are some differences in emphasis in the findings among departments by field. These special characteristics are

noted as follows:

Chemistry

This field emphasizes its nature as an international discipline, culture free, and concentrates on admitting the best qualified students available to its programs from wherever they apply. This practice results in cosmopolitan departments of students and faculty with varied cultural backgrounds but it appears that little further thought is given to international education and to specific potential gains from the presence of foreign students. The Ph.D degree is stressed for all graduate students.

Electrical Engineering

This discipline seeks high caliber students regardless of nationality and is considered a popular field among foreign students. Even more foreign students may be enrolled if the field continues its decline in popularity among U.S. students. The study of electrical engineering in the United States is relatively advanced and not much attention is given to the problem faced by the foreign student in applying the knowledge gained here to his home country. The departments believe that as a result a high percentage of electrical engineering graduates stay in the United States.

Civil Engineering

The departments are aware that the programs encompassed by this field are significant to the development of other countries; however, other than recognizing the potential contributions of foreign students, little attention has been given to tailoring civil engineering programs to meet the developmental needs of other countries.

Economics

There is some evidence that input from foreign students is welcomed and encouraged in the international dimensions of the discipline, in developmental economics and in area studies programs. In this field, too, there is some reason to believe that increasing numbers of foreign students may be admitted if the numbers of high quality U.S. applicants continue to drop.

Business Administration

The MBA degree program is attractive to foreign students for future utilization in their home countries. At the same

time, there is evidence that this discipline is eager to enroll well qualified foreign students who may contribute a variety of perspectives to the quality of the program. Departments emphasize the benefits from exposing U.S. business students to these foreign future businessmen in light of the growing internationalization of business. In addition, it is thought that all students benefit from contact with persons representing different cultural attitudes toward business development and operation.

Educational Administration

It appears that little special effort is made in this discipline to relate educational specialties to the needs of foreign students, although their presence is considered generally enriching. These departments have less international involvement than most of the others surveyed.

General Conclusions

- The departments surveyed have not developed policies for their involvement in international education but did list benefits from the presence of foreign students in their programs.
- The departments expect the same level of performance from both the foreign and the U.S. student.
- Foreign students generally perform as well academically as U.S. students and receive their degrees in the same length of time.

Commentary by the Task Force

We have taken note of the departments' desire to enroll the most qualified applicants academically no matter what their nationalities, in order to advance the frontiers of knowledge. While we applaud the ideals of educational advancement and geographical mix, it is clear that the departments are not realizing the full potential of the international component. We believe that some of the additional reasons why departments enroll foreign students need emphasizing. The kinds of contributions foreign students can make to departments are suggested by the benefits cited by the departments when asked specifically what they hope to gain from the presence of foreign students. If the departments believe that

they benefit from the presence of foreign students, then we believe that more effort must be devoted to utilizing the "foreignness" of these students in the learning process. Of course, capitalizing on this resource and developing its potential is a shared responsibility – with both students and faculty contributing.

In general, we see the departments showing a considerable amount of goodwill toward foreign students and regarding them favorably. Faculty are receptive to students from abroad despite problems that develop, and indeed, the reason we have foreign students is that the faculty want them. Obviously, the departments are pleased with the foreign student segment but they appear to have given little serious thought to what may happen to this segment given increased enrollment pressures and budgetary constraints.

Foreign students bring different sets of expectations with them and it appears that departments have not paid much attention to these differences. The faculty apparently see their work as one of a universal nature; they may not be aware of the complexities of cross-cultural education and may not understand the emotionalism and dynamics of cross-cultural learning. An investment of time and effort is essential in achieving the goal of fulfilling the student's personal, educational and career objectives as well as the objectives of international education.

GROUP III – ADMISSIONS

Findings

Institutional policies of a general nature on graduate admissions of all students have been articulated at most institutions but they are not very useful to the departments as guidelines in the specific admission of foreign students. Most of the universities lacked an institutional policy on foreign student admissions, and in those cases where a policy did exist, it was invariably brief and general in nature. An explicit policy existed in only one university and, even so, there had been little follow-through to the two departments surveyed. In fact, one department was not familiar with it at all. It follows, then, that the departments are generally unaware of any institutional policy on foreign student admissions, and in the few cases where they do exist, such policies do not have much actual effect on admissions decisions.

The departments also operate without specific departmental policies on foreign student admissions. They do apply criteria such as "academic ability" and "prior preparation" in making their admissions decisions but these criteria are not part of formulated departmental policies. In general, the departments have learned from their prior experience in admitting foreign students which admissions criteria and guidelines best serve their individual programs.

Admissions decisions are made primarily by the administrative officers of departments (i.e. the chairman, director of graduate studies, et. al.) ranging from single person consideration of applications in some departments up to eight person committees in others. The expertise of individual faculty members is frequently utilized but the general faculty of a department are seldom involved in the admissions process. Faculty actively support foreign applicants in whom they are interested, but this interest rarely takes the form of pressure to admit "favorite son" or unqualified candidates.

Graduate schools, which frequently provide general policy and procedural guidelines for admissions, and admissions offices are involved very little in actual admissions decisions. They may serve as collection points for application materials

and perform credentials evaluation services but rarely exercise decisive influence unless an applicant's background clearly does not meet minimal standards. These offices usually approve what are essentially departmental decisions; however, they and/or foreign student advisers' offices often review applicants' financial status and level of English proficiency. Although final authority rests with the graduate schools, this authority is seldom exercised.

Institutions and departments are aware of the sensitive issue of quotas in foreign student admissions and are quietly attempting to adjust any imbalances (i.e. oversupply) in percentages of foreign students, where they are thought to exist, without the imposition of quotas. The only stated quotas operating in foreign student admissions are those general restrictions imposed upon the departments by graduate school offices to control total enrollment. The concept of quota is unattractive philosophically to most persons who commented on this subject and the desire to maintain the autonomy of individual departments was often mentioned.

However, in actual operation, departments do sometimes informally impose quotas on their selection of foreign students through their concern about such factors as the amount of available financial support, varied nationality representation, and the proportion of foreign to U.S. students. Many departments become concerned if their foreign student enrollment exceeds one-third of the total. Of the departments surveyed, percentages of foreign graduate student enrollment to total graduate student enrollment vary from about 2% to 49% within a single department. The average amounted to 20%. Although departments prefer the flexibility of operating without quotas, a few indicated they could live with one. If quotas were put into effect, these departments report that they would stress the admissions criteria of academic ability and intent to return home.

In a few universities, some departments admit a disproportionate number of well qualified foreign students as a means of maintaining the size of the department without sacrificing its quality. However, most departments do not admit foreign students in order to avoid admitting some academically less qualified U.S. students.

Most departments believe that their Masters programs serve as screening devices for the Doctorate and will admit all students at the Masters level in order to determine the quality of work they are able to handle. If a student successfully passes this test of his ability, he is then considered for Doctoral candidacy. The credentials of prospective students applying directly to Doctoral programs appear to be more carefully scrutinized than those for whom the Masters would be the terminal degree. Only one department (in civil engineering) indicated that it exercised more care in admitting foreign student Ph.D candidates than U.S. Ph.D candidates. Decisions to admit at either the Masters or Doctoral levels appear to be made more on the basis of the nature of the field and individual academic potential rather than on current employment prospects in the United States.

The fields of study show more variation in admissions than do the institutions. Chemistry admits directly for the Ph.D whereas the others surveyed prefer to admit for the Masters with the understanding that exceptional students will continue through the Doctorate. Most of the foreign graduate students in business administration and many in civil engineering terminate after the Masters degree.

Sponsorship of a foreign student applicant by one of the recognized agencies[2] or foundations[3] lends favorable weight to an admissions decision because the departments believe that these students have had a preliminary screening, that they are unlikely to put any future financial burden on the department, and that they will probably perform on a high level. It is impossible to measure the amount of effect of sponsorship on the admissions decision but it appears to be a strong consideration.

In offering admission, the departments do not attempt to determine the intention of the applicant either to remain in the United States or to return home following the completion of his academic program. The primary consideration in

---

[2]e.g. The Institute of International Education; American Friends of the Middle East

[3]e.g. The Ford Foundation; The Rockefeller Foundation

the decision to admit appears to be the responsibility the department believes it has in selecting the best qualified student and providing for him a maximum educational opportunity regardless of the individual's future plans.

In their search for superior students, institutions and departments want to have as much information as possible describing the applicant's academic potential. There was wide variation in the relative emphasis placed on the kinds of evaluative materials departments found valid and no really clear-cut pattern emerged. In roughly descending order, and to varying degrees, the following information is considered to be of importance: transcripts covering all previous academic work at the collegiate level; the type and quality of the institution(s) at which the applicant previously studied and class rank within the institution; results of tests–e.g. GRE[4], ATGSB[5], Miller Analogies, etc.; measures of English proficiency TOEFL[6] or a substitute; letters of recommendation when the writer is personally known to the department; and special examinations. As mentioned previously, preselection by and the recommendation of an agency or foundation are also important considerations in assessing potential.

Finances play an important part in the admission of foreign graduate students and most of the universities in the study have in recent years insisted on having evidence of adequate financial support before admitting a student. Only two of the schools accept applicants who are academically admissable but who have questionable financial resources. However, only one university insists on proof of support for the entire graduate program.

The matter of financial support is considered in a variety of ways by the departments and institutions surveyed. Support ranges from no aid for the first year to acceptance only if the department intends to support totally. Some departments reject an applicant if unable to offer support or if the applicant cannot provide adequate proof of his ability to

---

[4]Graduate Record Examination

[5]Admissions Test for Graduate Study in Business

[6]Test of English as a Foreign Language

finance his education, while others will admit the student and then rely on the foreign student adviser's office to clear or reject on grounds of financial solvency for at least the first year.

General Conclusions

- Most of the universities surveyed do not have specific institutional and departmental policies regarding foreign graduate student admissions.
- Admissions decisions are almost exclusively made by the departments.
- Stated quotas do not play a part in foreign student admissions but some departments do admit with self-imposed limitations in mind.
- At present, foreign students are not generally over-admitted to avoid admitting less qualified U.S. students.
- Most foreign graduate students (in common with U.S. students) are admitted first to Masters programs, which serve as screening devices for the Doctorate.
- Agency or foundation sponsorship of a foreign student applicant adds favorable weight to the admissions decision.
- Intention to return home or to remain in the United States indefinitely upon completion of the academic program is not a factor in the admissions decision. However, there are signs that this may become a consideration in the future.
- Departments rely on various kinds of informational materials in evaluating an applicant's academic potential and there is a great variation in the relative weight departments assign to these items.
- Adequate financial support is considered very important and almost all institutions require evidence of it before admitting a student.

Commentary by the Task Force

We note that although some thought may be given to the implications of the "brain drain" in admitting foreign students, even faculty who indicate that they would favor taking note of intent to return home at the time of admission seem

unwilling to incorporate this consideration into their admissions criteria. We are interested in the comments that were offered to the effect that this may become a more important factor in the future, given increasing unemployment and financial support pressures in the United States.

Apparently, the departments are using all the materials available to them in evaluating the foreign student applicant's academic potential and the fact that they weigh the validity of these items differently no doubt is based on prior departmental experiences. We caution that preliminary screening by outside agencies does not necessarily mean that sponsored applicants are well selected. We recommend that departments make wide use of the expertise of persons at their own institutions who are skilled in foreign credentials evaluation.

We realize that each department will have its own rationale for the numbers of foreign students it considers adequate. As noted earlier, the departments prefer to operate without a formal quota system yet imply that for a variety of reasons they do exercise control over the number and perhaps nationality of foreign students admitted. We fully recognize the advantages of a flexible admissions policy in this regard. We also recognize the danger of imposing restrictions on numbers without a carefully thought through and articulated rationale upon which to base such restrictions. The establishment of definite quotas for foreign students within departments as part of a reasoned policy may be preferable to an ad hoc, informal decision to restrict based on expediency. In addition, we recognize that a department with a very small number of foreign students may be limiting its enrollment because it may not believe that it has as much to offer foreign students as departments with larger numbers.

However, we would encourage expansion of international educational exchange opportunities whenever feasible for the department for the very reasons given by the departments when asked what they hoped to gain from the presence of foreign students. We are especially interested in education for development, in social engineering—so to speak, and certainly those departments with larger foreign student enrollments have opportunities for this kind of emphasis.

We recognize that at the departmental level, the financial

aid that is offered to applicants is a function of departmental objectives and budgetary priorities and we urge departments to review their criteria and update them if necessary. Even more basic, though, is the fact that the role of finances in foreign student admissions is a complex one tied directly to the funding crisis of higher education in general. The Commentary in the next section on financial aid includes our plea for additional sources of financial support. Although respondents did not appear to consciously relate the effect of reduced funds to the admission of foreign students, there is already evidence that admissions are being affected and will be more so in the future unless new funding becomes available.

GROUP IV – FINANCIAL AID

Findings

Most of the universities in the study do not have institutional policies on financial aid to foreign students except the general procedure of requiring evidence of adequate financial support for admittance. However, as a matter of institutional policy, two of the universities would not grant aid during the first year of graduate study.

Most of the departments surveyed do not offer financial aid to first year foreign graduate students, but will make an exception for the students who have completed a prior Bachelors or Masters degree in the United States. Most departments will consider foreign students for assistance in their second year, particularly if they are in Doctoral programs (e.g. almost all the Ph.D candidates in chemistry receive some financial aid). In most cases, departments are committed to finding some departmental assistance for continuing foreign students of great promise.

The most common form of departmental aid is the assistantship – first the research assistantship and then the teaching assistantship. One university uses an hourly student payroll as an additional form of assistance. In most universities, a substantial number of the foreign students hold research or teaching assistantships and in several departments 50% or more of the foreign students are receiving departmental aid. These assistantships vary considerably in financial amount and in the period of time they cover. In addition, it is difficult to tell from our data whether the amount the foreign student receives through these arrangements is adequate.

Except for departmental assistantships, little additional institutional aid is available or awarded to foreign students. In most instances (other than when U.S. government monies are involved), foreign students are eligible to compete for fellowships, non-resident fee waivers, and grants-in-aid; but, in general, these sources constitute only a minor reservoir of support. Precise data on the sources and amount of financial aid for foreign graduate students were lacking in a large number of the universities surveyed. In addition, specific informa-

tion was not sought on long-term loan funds for foreign students.

Most of the institutions do make short-term emergency loans to foreign students. The amount available through this type of loan is small—the largest loan appears to be up to $600. These funds usually are administered through the foreign student adviser's office and, in all but two universities, co-signers are not required for these loans although one institution requires references.

It seemed difficult for the institutions surveyed to assess accurately the seriousness of the current financial problems faced by foreign students. A general feeling was expressed, though, that married students are beginning to encounter serious problems and that even single students have to manage their money very carefully and have to work harder just to meet minimal needs. It was thought that one of the major reasons a serious problem might not yet be generally felt is that the initial financial screening processes have recently rejected many students who would be likely to develop serious financial problems during their first year of study. Concern was expressed about the ability of departments to maintain an adequate level of support for foreign students in view of constantly increasing costs, budgetary cutbacks, decreasing contract research funds and growing demands upon existing funds for support of U.S. minority students.

However, only three departments think that some of their students are having serious financial problems; most departments believe that their foreign students are not encountering serious financial difficulties at this time.

General Conclusions

- Most of the universities surveyed do not have institutional policies on financial aid to foreign students.
- Most of the departments would not offer financial aid to first year students but are committed to finding assistance for continuing high quality foreign students.
- The most usual form of departmental aid is the assistantship—first research, then teaching.
- Little additional institutional aid is available or awarded to foreign students.

- Co-signers are not required for loans to foreign students at most universities.
- It is difficult to get at the question of how many foreign students face financial hardship; however many do now, some respondents think that increasing numbers will have this problem in the future if more students are admitted without university aid.

Commentary by the Task Force

The rising cost of higher education in the United States is making it increasingly difficult for many foreign students to continue, or to undertake, their studies here. We are concerned that funding students beyond the first year may become a serious problem unless greater attention is given to this matter and new sources of funding are developed.

The annual business meeting of the 1971 NAFSA conference reviewed five separate resolutions on financing international educational exchange and authorized their combination into one statement. We support the statement that, among other things, asks the President of NAFSA to establish a joint task force of NAFSA members and university and college financial aid officers to explore and develop proposals that will encourage the federal government, state governments, banks, and educational institutions themselves to find new means of financing international educational exchange programs. Among the areas to be explored are federally and state guaranteed loans, tuition fee reductions, work permits, work-study programs, practical training extensions, an international education loan fund on a multi-national basis, international education teaching and research assistantships, and new kinds of flexible loan-scholarship plans, including those with "forgiveness" features.

We believe that a fair proportion of foreign students have financial problems and that the departments do not seem to be aware of this. We need more information on student perceptions of their needs and precise data on the sources and amount of financial support available within the institutions for foreign graduate students.

Findings

All but two of the 24 departments surveyed rely on the TOEFL[7] score, when available, as the primary indicator of a foreign student applicant's English proficiency. One-third of the universities require the TOEFL whereas the remainder will accept a substitute measure although a TOEFL score is preferred if available. The range of reported minimal required TOEFL scores is between 450-550. In general, the institutions will waive the TOEFL for students with previous academic work in the United States (particularly if they have U.S. degrees), for students from countries in which English is the first language, and for incoming students whose language of instruction has been English. In granting these exceptions, the institutions usually request some kind of certification. The majority of the institutions require testing again and, in some cases, interviews upon arrival on campus. Courses in English as a second language are usually recommended to students whose scores are unsatisfactory.

The departments recognize the importance of adequacy in English to the successful pursuit of a graduate program although they vary greatly in how they deal with the problem of inadequate English and its inhibiting effect on academic progress. The technical and physical science fields surveyed tend to admit with slightly lower scores than those required for the social science and education disciplines. If applicants' scores are lower than the minimum established by the department or university, admission is usually denied. However, on campuses where courses in English as a second language are offered, otherwise strong candidates may be admitted under relaxed requirements with the understanding that they enroll in the English program. The private institutions offer fewer classroom opportunities to improve English proficiency than do the public institutions. In the latter, both testing and courses in English as a second language are generally avail-

[7] Ibid

able. The private institutions tend, therefore, to adhere more strictly to cut-off scores. The departments surveyed considered a high English language score as a very strong influence on the decision to admit an applicant. Some faculty stated that lack of proficiency in English is the single greatest problem in the education of foreign students.

The departments show little concern with the foreign student's English proficiency after the student has been admitted. As previously stated, a number of institutions require testing upon arrival and offer special courses in English for foreign students to those whose scores do not meet their standards. But, in only a few cases do the departments require or strongly encourage participation in these courses even if tests indicate the need for such work, unless the student has been admitted on this condition. Departments are willing to reduce course loads if students are enrolled in these programs but students are reluctant to spend what they consider to be valuable time on this subject. They do not see increased competence in English as central to their academic achievement.

With two exceptions, foreign students are not required to achieve a prescribed level of English language proficiency for graduation. The two institutions that are exceptions to this practice determine English proficiency by either: a) the initial examination given at the time of arrival on campus or satisfactory completion of the recommended English courses, or b) the initial examination or completion of a course followed by retesting.

In general, there is little departmental or institutional expectation regarding the student's level of performance in English by the completion of his degree program. As long as the foreign student satisfactorily completes departmental and graduate school academic requirements, he graduates. In addition, very little, if any, determination is made of the improvement in language skills of the student during his years of residence at the university.

General Conclusions

- Most departments rely on the TOEFL as the primary indicator of a foreign student applicant's English proficiency.

- The departments vary in the extent of their consideration of English proficiency as an important factor in the admissions decision, although almost all of them recognize the relationship between English proficiency and academic success.
- Testing and course work in English as a second language are more readily available in the public institutions than in the private ones.
- Foreign students are not required at most institutions to achieve a prescribed level of English language proficiency for graduation.

Commentary by the Task Force

It is gratifying to learn that the universities and the departments are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of a good command of English to the successful pursuit of a graduate program. We think that this increased attention to English proficiency is a very important consideration in admitting foreign students and in designing their academic programs. Despite this awareness and efforts to admit students with English language proficiency, some foreign students will need and profit from additional instruction in English as a second language. We believe that universities, either singly or in concert, have a responsibility to develop and/or improve programs to meet this need. At the same time, it must be stated that an inflexible insistence upon a minimum score on a standardized test or other assurances that the student is fully competent in English as a condition for admission presents the real risk of refusing admission to applicants who may be in other ways exceptionally qualified. It is in order to minimize this risk that the Task Force strongly urges universities and colleges to make it possible for otherwise gifted and acceptable students to obtain the necessary competence in English either prior to or during the initial period of enrollment through the establishment or strengthening of programs in English as a second language.

GROUP VI – SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

Findings

A variety of subjects were included in the checklist under the section titled Services and Programs. These subjects ranged from questions concerning effective cooperation between academic departments and the foreign student adviser's office to questions about departmental contact with their foreign alumni, with many questions about other kinds of services and programs included in between these two subjects. Therefore, the findings and comments below cover a broad range of topics.

There is evidence of effective cooperation between the academic departments surveyed and the foreign student adviser's office. This cooperation extends to almost all non-academic problems and to matters of general foreign student welfare. In a few cases, consultation about academic concerns was also mentioned as part of the cooperative relationship. These findings were supported both by foreign student advisers and departmental administrators; however, some concern was expressed about whether the department's faculty, in general, are aware of this cooperation. In the cases of only three departments was concern expressed by the foreign student adviser that consultation primarily occurs when emergencies or unusual problems have reached a stage of advanced development.

The departments recognize that the foreign student adviser's office serves as the institution's formal channel through which foreign students communicate their needs and that many special services are offered to foreign students by foreign student adviser's offices and international student centers. Within the department, foreign students are encouraged, as are all graduate students, to communicate their needs through their faculty advisers and their departmental graduate student councils.

Departments do not provide special orientation and counseling services for their foreign students nor are these services provided on a departmental basis by the foreign student adviser's office. Instead, a department's foreign students par-

ticipate in the university-wide foreign student orientation program, followed, in a few cases, by orientation sessions sponsored by the departments for all their entering graduate students.

Most departments do not make special accommodations for foreign students. As mentioned earlier, almost all of them will adjust course loads during the initial semester if the student suffers a language handicap and most institutions offer courses or programs in English as a second language. One-third of the departments will allow differential language requirements for the Ph.D. In some cases, this means substituting the student's native language and in others, substituting English. In general, most institutions and departments do not make adjustments in such matters as: waiving dormitory room deposits and application fees, relaxing the required grade-point average while a language handicap exists, postponing qualifying examinations and establishing special courses and seminars other than in English and Speech.

Foreign students are serving on departmental committees in one-third of the departments and the opportunity for such placement exists in one-half of the institutions surveyed. However, there is some doubt about whether the student is on these committees as a representative of the department's foreign students or in some other capacity (e.g. as a graduate student in general, as a teaching assistant, etc.). Nevertheless, foreign students appear to be under-represented on these committees. The remaining departments implied or stated that no students, foreign or American, serve on their committees.

The departments do not offer academic subjects or programs especially designed for foreign students. However, three programs are offered at two of the universities surveyed which are designed to have relevance for developing nations. It is the intent of these programs (two in engineering and one in economics) to appeal to qualified foreign graduate students from such countries.

One of them, in the field of engineering, is of particular interest. A student may apply for admission to this program in addition to his major. If accepted, he takes an interdisciplinary, international curriculum related to his specialty

and, if he completes all requirements, he receives two degrees. In general, though, programs with an international component are designed for and open to all graduate students. With the exception of programs operating under AID contracts, no programs are designed for students from specific countries.

In regard to job placement, most departments rely on the facilities of their campus-wide placement centers. Only one department (in business administration) has its own formally structured placement service. However, faculty members frequently offer assistance in locating employment opportunities in academic and professional fields in the United States. No department reported offering to assist in job placement overseas.

In only one department (in educational administration) are doctoral candidates encouraged to write their theses in absentia, in their own countries. This department and one other (in economics) would also encourage students to write on topics pertinent to their countries. One-fourth of the departments do not permit the writing of theses in absentia. A majority of departments indicate that they would permit students to write their theses in absentia if their topics pertain to the location in which they want to do their research and writing. However, this permission would be the exception and is not encouraged. The student has to express his interest in this kind of arrangement in order to effect it. Interestingly, no significant differences by department are noticeable on this question.

In most departments, the faculty will make an effort to determine the unique needs of a student's country in planning his program if the student expressly requests that this be done. The departments do not offer courses or seminars that are designed to help a foreign student better understand how he can use his U.S. education in his homeland—with the exception of the program in engineering mentioned previously. If the student requests assistance in relating his study here to his work at home, adjustments in individual programs can be made in some departments. However, few departments report that they see this effort as part of a departmental commitment to the student's education. Electrical

engineering departments noted parenthetically that they expect most of their foreign student graduates to attempt to stay in the United States.

The departments maintain only informal and infrequent contact with their foreign alumni and this contact is not designed to determine the usefulness of the foreign student's U.S. education after he returns home. In three of the universities, the foreign student adviser's office collects (or is beginning to collect) information of this type. The departmental, college, and/or institutional alumni offices at most universities include foreign alumni in their mailings but this contact is also infrequent and of a general nature.

One-third of the departments commented that they could see value in maintaining contact with their foreign alumni. The most frequently mentioned reasons they gave were: to provide recommendations concerning and to interview new foreign student applicants, to foster the continuing development of the department's ability to serve foreign nationals through assessing the relevance of its program to the former student's career, and to provide useful contacts for departmental faculty going abroad. The students interviewed were interested in maintaining contact with their departments after graduation but did not think that this was likely to happen.

General Conclusions

- Effective cooperation exists between the administrators of the academic departments surveyed and the universities' foreign student adviser's offices. However, in some cases, concern was expressed about whether the faculty in general are aware of this cooperation.
- Departments do not provide special orientation and counseling services for their foreign students.
- Most of the departments are not accommodating the special needs and problems of foreign students, except adjusting course loads during the initial semester if a language handicap exists.
- In one-third of the departments surveyed a few foreign students serve on departmental committees.
- The departments offer neither special services nor spe-

cial programs to foreign students as differentiated from those available to all students.

- Doctoral candidates are not encouraged to write theses in absentia on topics pertinent to their own countries. However, permission to do so is obtainable in a majority of the departments.
- In most departments, if the student requests it, the faculty will make an effort to determine the unique needs of a student's country in planning his program.
- The departments do not offer courses or seminars which are designed to help a foreign student better understand how he can use his U.S. education in his homeland.
- The departments do not maintain contact with their foreign alumni in order to determine the usefulness of their U.S. education after return home.

Commentary by the Task Force

We are pleased to see that cooperation between the departments and the foreign student adviser's office is effective and is recognized by both parties. However, we believe that untapped opportunities for greater collaboration exist in developing additional programs and services which could benefit the foreign graduate student. We urge that these possibilities be explored. Special orientation programs and counseling services for the department's foreign graduate students are two examples of potential assistance that warrant consideration.

We have taken note of the fact that there are few departmental services and programs for foreign students. Is this because general services and programs are often provided by the institution itself through the foreign student adviser's office (and other agencies) and the uniquely departmental possibilities are not recognized by the faculty? Is it due to lack of time? Is it due to low priority of all student services? We believe that departments can be of far greater service in meeting the special needs of foreign students and that ways in which this can be accomplished need examination.

It seems to us that foreign students (along with U.S. students) should clearly be able to contribute to the work of departmental committees and that this experience will in

turn contribute significantly to the student's education. Therefore, in the context of this study, we urge departments to consider broader foreign student participation on their committees. We also believe that, as a by-product, increased committee participation will contribute to more meaningful U.S.-foreign student relations.

Faculty should be more aware of the educational purposes of practical training opportunities.[8] A greater effort must be made by the faculty to assist in the placement of graduating students in positions where appropriate training is available as a part of the total educational experience. Such effort is especially necessary during this period of limited employment possibilities. We encourage departmental faculty to play a key role in this important endeavor in cooperation with the student, the foreign student adviser, the placement officer, and other appropriate colleagues.

We think that the decision a foreign student makes to try to remain in the United States or to return home is in large part influenced by efforts made by the university and the student to relate the student's program of study to the social, economic and employment conditions in his home country. His inclination will be to stay in the United States if all of his educational and training experiences are identical to those received by his U.S. counterparts. Attention to the process of adapting U.S. training to conditions in the home country is greatly needed. We would like to see departments give more attention to the connection between study here and return home in order to provide the foreign student with a realistic choice about his future.

---

[8]Immigration regulations permit the student holding an F-1 or J-1 visa to remain in the United States after completion of a degree program for a period not to exceed eighteen months for the purpose of receiving "practical training." Such full time work experience must be in the major field of study in which the student earned his degree. Permission to accept practical training is granted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service upon recommendation of the school attended by the student. The foreign student adviser should be consulted for the procedural details.

POSTSCRIPT

The survey team reported that during the interviews the departmental personnel were interested and cooperative and that the individual faculty members were cordial and responsive. As a result of the survey, relationships between faculty and foreign student advisers have developed. The design of the pilot study proved effective in identifying the pertinent issues and problems at individual institutions. Some variation was noticed in the responses different individuals within a single university or department gave to the same question. We interpret this as evidence of the independence of units within a university community and the lack of communication among them.

We do not feel that there was sufficient response from the foreign students to draw inferences. However, from the comments we did receive, their responses were in general agreement with those from faculty and administrators. In addition, it should be noted that the instrument was designed for the faculty. A different instrument needs to be designed for foreign students that will elicit their responses. Some questions might have been formulated to obtain student impressions with regard to: evidence of prejudice, attitude toward return home, dynamics of relationships with departmental faculty, and relationships with U.S. students. In general, though, the students seem to be satisfied with the kind of education they are receiving. We think that they are conditioned to an uncritical attitude about U.S. education and that they are accepting of it. As more of them have to return home because, among other factors, of the current unemployment situation in the United States, we wonder whether they will continue to look so uncritically at the education they receive.

Additional Results:

Each member of the survey team was asked to comment on the value, if any, to the interviewer, department, or institution that may have resulted from the investigation. In reviewing these responses, it became apparent that as a result of conducting the survey many developments have occurred

which have important implications for the universities and their staffs. These developments, reported by interviewers as directly resulting from the survey, although not considered in its design, are as follows:

- Additional avenues of communication have been opened between the departments and the foreign student adviser.
- An awareness of the mutuality of interests and endeavors has intensified between the departments and the administration creating greater possibilities for future cooperation and sharing of responsibilities.
- A rethinking, or an initiation of thinking, has developed in the departments about their role in international education and their responsibility to the foreign graduate student. For the first time, some departments are thinking about many of the issues covered by the checklist. In turn, the foreign student adviser has learned about many departmental policies and procedures.
- The foreign student adviser's office at one participating university has written and published a brochure about international student services which is designed to explain its program to the university community.
- Participation in intercultural groups for U.S. faculty and foreign students/foreign faculty is being considered on one campus as an alternative to other faculty committee assignments.
- One university has begun to work on a policy statement on international education for consideration by its regents.

Members of the survey team recommended that additional surveys be conducted in other colleges and universities and with additional departments in their own universities. We also encourage other institutions to undertake similar studies, not only for answers to the questions and issues we raised, but for the other benefits that may result from the investigation. As it turned out, the survey itself was a vehicle for dialogue between the departments and the foreign student adviser. The checklist, accompanied by our commentary on its usefulness, is included in the Appendices.

We believe the project has demonstrated that the educa-

tion of the foreign graduate student is, or should be, a team effort – an effort in which faculty, administration, and, of course, the students themselves fully participate. In this process, the foreign student adviser should play a central role as a professional who is skilled in the dynamics of international educational exchange.

Relationship to the Wingspread Report:

In June 1970, a colloquium was held at Wingspread, the Johnson Foundation's conference facility in Racine, Wisconsin, to identify pertinent questions relative to the growing influx of foreign graduate students to the United States and to reach consensus on priorities for study and implementation. The colloquium was sponsored by the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions.[9] The report from this meeting, titled *The Foreign Graduate Student: Priorities for Research and Action*, appeared in 1971 as our study was underway. We noted the significant similarity of issues covered by both the colloquium and our study – although our study was conceived before the report was published and was not designed to respond to it.

Some of the priority issues raised in the Wingspread Report which parallel some of the concerns of our project may be transposed into questions for which our project provides at least partial answers.

1] Have the universities/departments developed a policy (with regard to the admission and education of foreign students)? If so, is it translated into action? Do they feel that a policy is important? Or are they satisfied (or content) with what they have and do with or without a policy? Do they feel a need, or have a need, for a rationale?

The data collected clearly indicate that, for the most part, statements of policy and procedure have not been developed. In some schools, an implied philosophy or rationale exists

[9]The National Liaison Committee consists of representatives from the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the College Entrance Examination Board, the Council of Graduate Schools, the Institute of International Education and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

but there is little evidence of follow-through. In other words, policy statements are rarely translated into practical application. Nor was the impression gained that having a policy would be of great importance. As noted previously, most departments feel content with what they are doing and the results they are obtaining from the foreign student contingent. However, as also noted earlier, there is a growing belief that a thoroughly thought through formulation of institutional commitment and a resultant statement of policy may become of greater importance, perhaps even a necessity, in the near future. The Task Force fully concurs with this latter opinion.

2] Do the departments and graduate schools really feel they need to know about manpower needs, intention to return, utilization of a U.S. education, relevancy of curriculum, difficulties experienced by students in the United States, etc.?

The data from our small pilot project indicate that departmental administrators and faculty have not made it their concern to consider these elements when admitting foreign students and providing services for them. The Wingspread Report implies that they should and the Task Force voices strong agreement.

3] Is the continued admission of foreign students indeed "facing dark days" and "seriously threatened"?

We would have to infer from the responses received that departmental educators and administrators have given little thought to what may lie ahead for the foreign student population. They recognize in a general sense that funds are more difficult to obtain, that the belt must be tightened, that present priorities and procedures may have to be (indeed are being) re-evaluated, that fewer students (all students) may result from reduced income and high costs, etc. But they do not seem to translate these realities specifically into the foreign student situation. The Task Force is convinced that the universities and departments must begin to think seriously

about their international commitment and the foreign student role in that commitment in order to avoid the possibility of future "dark days".

4] Are departments concerned (have they tried to measure) the contribution of the foreign student to the university, to the profession? What benefits do departments derive from foreign students? Are departments/universities concerned about how the foreign student contributes at home?

Unfortunately, our inquiry did not involve itself deeply in these important issues. A general inference that could be made is that the universities/departments seek the best qualified students with the potential to take full advantage of academic offerings and opportunities in order that they will enhance the quality of the department, the university and their chosen profession. As noted in the text, when asked specifically what departments hoped to gain from the presence of foreign students a number of potential benefits were mentioned. But these seem to be of incidental importance and rarely translated into action. Likewise, there seems to be little concern about how the student contributes to his country and profession after leaving the United States. The Task Force feels strongly that some research must be performed to measure the real contribution of foreign students while in the United States and after their return. In the meantime, the departments should investigate the means to implement programs which will better utilize the foreign student population in the total learning process.

5] In the selection process do departments consider the purposes of the applicant or merely the credentials? Is this important? Is having a job at home to return to of any significance?

Certainly our study clearly shows that the quality of an applicant's credentials, including endorsements regarding his scholarly potential and scores on standard tests are of primary interest in the decision to admit or not admit. His purposes for wishing to study in the United States and at that

university, whether he intends to return home after completion of study, or having a job at home to which he will return do not appear to be of much importance either in consideration for admission or in planning an academic program after arrival on campus. The Task Force believes that these factors are of great importance both in admission and program planning.

6] Do departments really believe that quotas for foreign students (formal or informal) are necessary, inevitable, desirable?

As indicated in the text, the departments involved in this study do not normally employ quotas and in general would prefer not to. Admissions committees do not wish to admit a "disproportionate" number of foreign students and often will restrict numbers from a specific country or geographical area in order to preserve some balance. At our point of inquiry, the reporters did not get the impression that the departments believed quotas to be necessary, inevitable or desirable. The flexibility of admitting students without a quota was unanimously preferred.

7] Is it true that departments see foreign students as cheap labor in the labs or as teaching assistants?

This question was not raised in our project and we have no responses that relate to it. Whether it is possible to obtain a frank answer to this question is highly doubtful.

Needless to say, the findings reported in this publication represent a very small segment of higher education in the United States. The data recorded should not be considered as conclusive because of the small sample and the imprecision of the methodology employed in obtaining the information. Certainly we do not propose to give definitive answers to the issues raised in the Wingspread Colloquium. A careful reading of the Wingspread Report, as well as this one, necessitates the conclusion that there exists a great need for more concrete data in all these areas and for further inquiry into the many

questions raised by educators throughout the United States. We hope that the present investigation placed some of the issues in better focus and that it will serve as a stimulus for thoughtful and scholarly researchers in our institutions to begin answering questions rather than simply posing them.

Other Issues and Research Needs:

As was mentioned in the Foreword, the project described in this publication evolved from a meeting in which crucial issues in foreign student programs were identified and discussed. Our report deals with only one area of the many issues considered—the policies and procedures of graduate departments in relationship to foreign students. Some of the other issues which we believe are deserving of consideration and investigation are elaborated upon in the paragraphs that follow:

We need to look further into the relationship between foreign and U.S. students to discover what the benefits are for each of them from contact with the other. Are the experiences of both enriched? Does this exposure contribute to the broadened horizons of both?

The kind and quality of education the foreign student receives must be examined. We should query the student at different stages of his stay on campus and then again after he graduates and returns home. Specifically, more needs to be learned about the relationship of his study here to his job at home. It is our belief that the measure of the quality of his education will depend a great deal on what the student is able to do in the pursuit of his career.

It is important for us to know about the kinds of contributions foreign students are making to our universities and, in turn, the kinds of incidental learning that foreign students acquire during the course of their stay here. If the foreign student is learning new skills, attitudes and techniques, we also need to know how he will (or does) make use of them after he returns to his own society.

Some professionals in international education believe that the quality and maturity of foreign students coming to the United States have substantially improved over the years with

the consequence that the training of foreign students can, in the main, be limited to graduate and professional education. On the other hand, it appears that foreign applicants to graduate institutions are coming in increasing numbers via transfer from U.S. undergraduate schools. Four year colleges, junior and community colleges and eventually U.S. high schools may become more important determinants in the preparation and sophistication of applicants to the graduate schools. Therefore, we must be aware of and concerned with the entire spectrum of education, the inter-relationship of the several levels and the impact of one with others.

There is growing evidence that foreign students, paralleling their domestic counterparts, are becoming more socially conscious and more and more concerned with values than with employment security. Some wish to relate with popular causes, i.e. Chinese students with Chinese-Americans; Latin American students with Mexican-Americans, etc., while others are anxious to play an active role in curriculum design and educational policy particularly as they relate to international programs. Some polarization may be taking place within the foreign student population as students identify with or reject the various ideologies and causes with which they are in contact on the campuses. We need to better understand the stresses and strains to which the foreign student is subjected, how he reacts and how they affect him academically, socially and personally.

Feelings of nationalism, of manifest destiny and of anti or pro Americanism ebb and flow and change in intensity throughout time. Such natural behavior is often spurred by how U.S. relations with other countries are perceived. Those of us who are professionals in international education should have an understanding of the factors which influence these behavioral changes and if and how they affect the objectives of cross-cultural learning.

Related to these issues, and affected by them, is the way in which the foreign student perceives the relevance of a U.S. education to his future outside the United States—economically, socially, politically and personally. Subjected to a host of cross-currents, how does he accommodate what he is doing and learning (and observing) as a student with what he must

do afterwards as a "third culture" person? Are present academic emphases upon black studies, ecology, urban renewal, transportation, minorities, and the like, of importance and utility to him? Do they have application for his future? Or do they merely interfere with and confuse the objectives for a study sojourn in the United States? How can we assist the foreign student in synthesizing the many and diverse forces which press upon him so that his total experience is significant and positive? How can foreign students be made vital partners with us in the learning and growing process?

These are some of the issues and concerns which demand our attention and our investigative skills if the continued education of growing numbers of foreign students in the United States is to have the positive results for which we all hope and strive.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES[10]

In early October[11], the Executive Committee of the Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars determined that a study should be undertaken immediately that would take an in-depth look at the foreign student picture on the graduate level at the larger institutions in the U.S.

There seems little doubt that the interest of the large American universities has become increasingly focused on the graduate student and, although we have a fair amount of data on where these students come from, what institutions they study at in the U.S., what fields of study they entered, etc., there is relatively little collective knowledge on a number of issues that lie beneath the statistical surface. Some of these questions would be, for example: What are the primary motives that lead academic departments to admit substantial numbers of foreign students? What specific contributions are expected of the foreign students? To what extent does the department feel an obligation to prepare the foreign students for a professional career in their countries? Should there be any quotas on the enrollment of foreign students at a time when there is a strong enrollment crunch coming from American students? If so, how would these quotas be arrived at? Are any departments taking in foreign students in order to maintain quality and quantity in the departmental enrollment? From a qualitative standpoint, how useful is our education to the foreign student, and are the particular interests of the foreign student being taken into consideration by the departments? Do the departments offer specific services in areas such as orientation and counseling to foreign students? You will find these questions and others relative to

---

[10]Prepared by the Task Force in Winter, 1971, for the reference of the university interviewers

[11]October, 1970

this in the proposed questions to departments that are attached.

The purpose for conducting this study is threefold:

1] By asking these fundamental questions of departments at 12 large American universities, it is hoped that NAFSA will be closer to having an accurate profile on a national basis of how foreign students truly fit into our graduate schools. It is our intention to have enough preliminary results on this study by the spring of 1971 so that they can be discussed at the Vancouver conference.

2] It is felt that once this pilot study is completed this winter enough would be learned about what questions to ask and how they should be asked so that a kind of national model could be put together that would serve any institution in this country interested in doing its own internal probing into fundamental issues.

3] It is foreseen that there will be enough substance in the results of the pilot study to serve as a stimulus for further study; for intensive discussion at regional workshops—perhaps in the fall of 1971—and for making recommendations through appropriate channels for possible changes if the study uncovers critical imbalances or problem areas. The intention would be to involve groups such as the Council of Graduate Schools in any possible future study, workshops and recommendations for change.

It is important to note that some of the issues our study will tackle were raised at a meeting on foreign graduate students held in Wisconsin this June.[12] We recommend for your immediate perusal the speech made to that meeting by Dr. Harari which is reprinted in the fall issue of *Exchange*.[13]

It is hoped that the reports which each of you submit will not only provide answers to most of the questions suggested in the attachment and provide pertinent data relative to these questions, but that it will also give impressions which you have on basic attitudes of the departments assigned that might not be reflected in the answers. In addition, it is hoped

[12] June, 1970

[13] Fall, 1970

that you will provide us with some idea of how both the explicit and implicit department policies on foreign students relate to any institutional policies on foreign students; to any guidelines of the central administration or of the graduate division; to the policies of key service offices, such as your financial aids office; and last but not least, whether adequate staffing and budget are provided to the foreign student office to serve effectively the foreign graduate student about whom we are raising all of these questions. Finally, some statement would be appreciated as to the current attitudes on campus—and in particular in the departments you question—toward the undergraduate foreign student.

Appendix B

CHECKLIST OF ISSUES AND QUESTIONS[14]

Group I
Institutional Policy

1] Has the institution articulated an objective or purpose for its involvement in international education? For educating international[15] students?

2] Have top-level administrators and trustees participated in formulating policies and procedures regarding foreign student programs? Have faculty and students been consulted? Foreign student advisers and admissions officials?

3] Do institutional, college and departmental *procedures* exist regarding the coordination of international programs? Of foreign student programs, specifically?

Group II
Departmental Policy

1] What does the department hope to gain from international student programs?

2] Does the department have the same level of performance expectation of the international student as it does of the U.S. student?

3] What is the general academic performance especially with respect to completion of degree requirements of the international students? How does this compare with that of the U.S. student?

Group III
Admissions

1] Does an institutional policy exist regarding graduate international student admissions? Does the department have an explicit policy on foreign student admissions?

---

[14]Developed by the Task Force in Winter 1971 for use as a guide by the university interviewers.

[15]The word "international" was frequently used in the checklist although the word "foreign" in this context is preferred.

2] How, and by whom, are admissions decisions made? How much influence is exerted by the graduate school office? The admissions office? Individual faculty?

3] Do quotas play a part in international student admissions? Do they specify the number of students to be admitted by the department? By nationality? What rationale is given for this? If no quotas exist, is it intentional or accidental? Would the department be receptive to the imposition of a quota on foreign students? What type of quota would it prefer?

4] Are admissions standards of the department consistent with other departments? How do they vary?

5] Does the department tend to overadmit international students to avoid admitting some academically second-rate U.S. students?

6] Are distinctions made in admitting international students for Master's programs as opposed to Ph.D programs? If so, is this because of current employment prospects in the U.S. or to other considerations?

7] How much effect does sponsorship (e.g. AID, IIE, foundations, industry) have on a student's admission?

8] Does the department attempt to determine the intention of the applicant to return to his home country upon completion of his academic program, *and* does it favor those who intend to return? How?

9] What are the difficulties in evaluating the academic potential of a graduate international student applicant? What is the relative emphasis placed on transcripts? Letters of recommendation? Special examinations?

10] What role do finances play in international student admissions? Does a policy exist regarding a financial requirement? On what is the requirement based? Does the department refuse admission based on the student's inadequate finances for the first year? Beyond the first year?

11] (For a frame of reference in this section it may be helpful to cite: 1) number of foreign students in the department; 2) number of domestic students; 3) number of total applications for admission and percent of foreign applicants; 4) percent of domestic and foreign applicants offered admission.)

Group IV
Financial Aid

1] Does the institution and/or the department have a policy regarding financial aid to international students? A commitment?

2] What percentage of international students receive departmental aid in the form of assistantships? Fellowships? Special grants? Aid outside the department?

3] What percentage of the international students receive aid from the institution?

4] Are U.S. sponsors or signatories required for foreign students to be considered for aid or for loans?

5] For what percentage of the foreign students in the department do finances represent a serious problem?

Group V
English

1] What criteria are used to determine English language proficiency?

2] What effect does English proficiency have on the admissions decision?

3] What is done for the admitted student who is deficient in the language?

4] Is the international student required to achieve a prescribed level of English language proficiency for graduation? How is this achievement ascertained?

Group VI
Services and Programs

1] Is the institution's commitment to international education reflected in effective cooperation between the academic departments and the office of international student affairs? Does this cooperation include special orientation and counseling services for the department's international students?

2] Has the institution or department made efforts to accommodate the special needs of foreign students through such measures as, for example, the waiver of dormitory room deposit, the application fee and/or deposit because of currency exchange restrictions, the relaxation of required grade-

point average while a language handicap exists, the establishment of special courses and seminars, differential language requirements for the Ph.D, etc.

3] Do special channels exist within the departments through which the international student can make his needs known? Are international students serving on any departmental committees?

4] What other special services are offered to foreign students as differentiated from those offered to all students? To other special minority groups?

5] Are special programs offered for foreign students? Foreign students from particular countries? Are training and practical experience opportunities provided? Does the department assist in job placement within the U.S. or abroad?

6] Are doctoral candidates permitted (encouraged) to write theses in absentia? In their own countries on topics pertinent to their own countries?

7] Are efforts made by academic advisers and other faculty to determine the unique needs of a student's country in planning his program?

8] Are there any regular courses or special seminars designed to help the international student better understand how he can use his U.S. education in his homeland?

9] Is there contact with foreign alumni to determine the usefulness of their U.S. education after their return home? What values are seen in maintaining contact with these alumni?

Appendix C

COMMENTARY BY THE TASK FORCE ON THE CHECKLIST

We offer the following commentary on the usefulness of the checklist as a guide in conducting this survey both for the information of readers of this report and for the reference of personnel at universities who are considering undertaking similar inquiries at their institutions. We assume that other inquirers will want to develop their own checklists to reflect the individuality of their universities and to meet their own specific requirements. We believe that this commentary can be helpful to them in designing such studies.

We want to emphasize again that we did not intend this checklist to be used as a questionnaire. Instead, it was designed to suggest the issues that the Task Force and survey team thought important to the study and to serve both as a general guide for the interviews and as a model for the preparation of the individual reports. The checklist turned out to be appropriate for these purposes and the 24 reports which resulted took the format of case studies. However, for ease in comparing information from many reports, we see a need in future studies for more statistical data–obtained through asking identical questions, the answers to which are presented in a uniform reporting style. One suggestion is to include an appended data sheet on which selected questions are answered in a precise way.

In regard to comments on specific groups of issues, two groups on the checklist stand as they are–i.e. we have no comments about the items contained under Group IV–**Financial Aid**, and Group V–**English**. The remaining four groups of issues on which we wish to comment are as follows:

Group I–Institutional Policy

In this group, we think it would be useful to know more precisely: 1) whether various university personnel are aware of any institutional policy on international education; 2) if, and how, such a policy has actually been implemented (with

examples); 3) who among the university community has been actively involved in the discussion and formulation of policy; and 4) when policies and/or procedures were established and whether they are considered to be relevant.

Group II—Departmental Policy

This group might (or should) be expanded and perhaps reworked in order to better discover the attitudes of faculty towards foreign students and international programs. Departmental policy, written or unwritten, results from a convergence of attitudes. It would be useful to know: 1) how attitudes toward foreign students are formed; 2) how different and perhaps conflicting attitudes are harmonized into policy and procedure; 3) if faculty and administration have conscientiously tried to understand how the department can best contribute to its international population; 4) if a serious effort has been made to understand and appreciate the contribution of foreign students to the department and the university; 5) given the universality of knowledge, whether faculty have endeavored to find ways in which the foreign student can most effectively apply such knowledge in light of his own country's level of development; 6) whether feelings and attitudes resulting from these concerns have been translated into policy and action.

Group III—Admissions

Item 4 on the list—i.e. "Are admissions standards of the department consistent with other departments? How do they vary?" provided responses that were of minimal use within the context of this inquiry. As indicated in the general comments above, we believe that it is essential to obtain statistical data for checklist item 11—in order to provide a sound basis for interpretation and to allow comparisons of departments. These statistics should be acquired and reported in uniform ways.

Group VI—Services and Programs

We noticed that many of the areas covered by this group of items were answered in response to questions raised under Group II (**Departmental Policy**). We suggest that Group VI be

reworked to avoid overlapping responses with Group II. Under item 2, which suggests possible ways of accommodating some special needs of foreign students, the example reading "the establishment of special courses and seminars" needs to be rephrased to elicit responses which reflect different levels of effort. Finally, we noted some confusion about the differences between practical training and job placement in the responses given to the questions raised by item 5. We suggest that this item be rephrased for clarity and, if necessary, explained by the interviewer.

LISTING OF UNIVERSITIES AND DEPARTMENTS SURVEYED

	UNIVERSITY location	UNIVERSITY type	BUSINESS ADMINISTR'N	CHEMISTRY	CIVIL ENGINEER'G	ECONOMICS	EDUCATION'L ADMINISTR'N	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER'G
1	SW	Public	73/550 13%					215/439 49%
2	MW	Public			46/118 39%		12/350 3%	
3	NE	Private				32/72 44%		24/130 18%
4	SW	Private		9/111 8%	60/179 33%			
5	MW	Public		19/172 11%		68/200 34%		
6	MW	Public	15/235 6%		7/58 12%			
7	NE	Public			11/76 15%	8/32 20%		
8	MW	Private		21/145 14%		29/79 38%		
9	NE	Private	20/200 10%	17/68 25%				
10	NE	Public		28/102 28%			5/69 7%	
11	S	Public				7/47 15%		17/40 43%
12	S	Public					5/258 2%	30/97 31%

KEY: Foreign Students / Total Students
% Foreign to Total Students

54/55

Appendix D